

A NEW  
DEFENCE

OF THE

Lord Bishop of BANGOR's

SERMON

On JOHN xviii. 36.

Considered as it is the Performance  
of a Man of Letters.

By an Impartial Hand.

'Tis so like nothing, that there's nothing like it.

LONDON:

Printed for JONAH BOWYER at the *Rose* at  
the West End of St. Paul's. 1720.

DEFENCE

5 11 7 4 0

Lord Bishop of Bangor's

2. FEB. 1901

Д. ШУХ И О. О.

Considered as it is the performance  
of a Man of Letters



*[Faint, illegible text at the bottom of the page]*



Printed for J. H. BOWMAN at the Press at  
the West End of St. Paul's Church.



are made to be heard, rather than to be read; and  
are too confined in the length allowed to them.



## NEW DEFENCE, &c.

**S**O many Pieces having been writ in Vindication of the Bishop of Bangor's famous Sermon, that 'tis not easy to know so much as the Names or Number of them; I have often wonder'd, that neither his L<sup>ty</sup> nor any of his Friends have ever once pleaded, what, in my humble Opinion, is the very best Defence that can be made for it; the *great Haste and Hurry*, in which it was compos'd; of which there appear in every part the most visible Marks, which plainly shew it not to be the Result of his L<sup>ty</sup>'s maturer Judgment, but a Heap of loose, general Thoughts, huddled up in a tumultuary manner, and thrown together for want of Time; without Art or Order *Sermons*, in the Nature of them, are not expected to be exact and labour'd Compositions, much less to be just Discourses or complete Treatises; especially when upon difficult and nice Subjects: They

are made to be heard, rather than to be read, and are too confined in the Length allowed to them, to take in a great Compass of Matter: And *Preachers* are often forced to write upon very short Notice, or by unforeseen Impediments thrown in their way, are so freightned in time, especially such as live in the bright Parts of this busy Town, that they are obliged to take up with their first Thoughts as they arise, having no Leisure to digest or to correct them: which unavoidably occasions great Inaccuracy, so that neither the Sentiments nor Expressions can be just, nor the Disposition of them proper. Hence it is that *Preachers* often perform in a manner much below themselves, as well as below the Subject they have undertaken.

And this appears to have been so much the Bishop of *Bangor's* Case in his late Sermon, so far as one can judge by the Composition it self, compared with his L——p's known Character, that I can truly say, I very much expected his Lordship would have made this one part at least of his Defence in his Answer to the *Report* of the *Committee*; which if he had done, it would doubtless have abated the keenness of his Adversaries, and disarmed them in great part of the sharp Resentments conceived against him, as well as lessen'd the general Offence, which it was easy to foresee would be taken at his Sermon. But his L——p, whether from his natural Temper, or the Spirit of Controversy which is become habitual to him, or from the Flattery of his weak Admirers, hath thought fit to take quite another turn, and hath defended his Sermon with such an Air of Contempt and Superiority, as if every Part of it were perfectly well consider'd, every Expression just what it should be, a Flag of Defiance is hung out, and his L——p is resolved neither to take nor give

give Quarter. This being the Case, I cannot expect his L——p's Thanks for helping him to an Excuse he scorns to use; yet so much am I a Friend to the *Liberty of the Understanding*, and to free Enquiries, and think so much Indulgence due to all ingenuous Attempts of that Kind, that I cannot deny my self the Pleasure of offering to the World this new Argument in his L——p's Defence, even against his Will, and hope to convince others, if not himself, that when his L——p composed this Sermon, which has given so much Offence, he had a very good Right to this Plea, however he may have since forfeited it. With this View I have reconsider'd his L——p's Sermon, and find my Sentiments just the same they were upon the first reading of it.

His Lordship having something *extraordinary* to offer about the Nature of the *Church*, prepares his Hearers for it by a *pompous Introduction*, which makes about a fourth part of the whole Sermon. This Introduction he begins with observing, "That one of those *great Effects*, which *Length of Time* is *seen* to bring along with it, is the "Alteration of the Meaning annexed to certain "Sounds. The Signification of a Word, well "known and understood by those who first made "use of it, is *very insensibly* varied by passing "through many Mouths, and by being *taken* "and *given* by Multitudes in common Dis- "course". I suppose his L——p would have said *given and taken*, but I intend not to insist upon little Things, which if I did, I should never have done. For what a Heap of Improprieties is there in these few Lines, in which *Length of Time* is said to be *seen*, *seen* to bring along with it an *Effect*, an Effect which is produced by *very insensible*, i. e. invisible Degrees, and this called a *great Effect*, though



though the Nature of Language be such, that no Effect of Length of Time is more natural, or less surprizing. How much better this very common Observation might have been expressed, his L——p may see in the elegant Words of *A. Gellius*, l. 13. c. 29. *Animadvertere est pleraque verborum Latinorum ex eâ significatione, in quâ nata sunt, decessisse vel in aliam longè vel in proximam, eamque decessionem factam esse consuetudine & inscitia temere dicentium, quæ cuimodi sint, non didicerint.* But his L——p is not content with a common Observation, till he has made it his own, by an extravagant pushing of it beyond all Sense and Truth. Very tragical Effects are to be imputed to this Change of the Sense affixed to certain Sounds: *It has INVADED the most sacred and important Subjects, touches the very VITALS of all that is good, and is just going to take from Mens Eyes the BOUNDARIES of right and wrong. Direful Scene! Impending Danger! Ruin, certain Ruin! Here is the justest Cause for Resistance in the World, it ought in Duty to be resisted with a more open and undisguised Zeal. What room for Passive Obedience in so desperate a Case? Who can be angry at his L——p's resisting Zeal, when it is so very necessary? When the very Vitals of all that is good are invaded, and the Boundaries of Right and Wrong can't a Minute longer be preserved, if not now bravely defended. As these effects are very tragical, so it was fit Causes should be assigned proportioned to them, to justify the better the Resistance of this bold Invader. His L——p therefore tells us, the great Instruments of this Evil, are the Ignorance and Weakness of some, and the PASSIONS and BAD DESIGNS of others. One would think his L——p were giving an Account of the Male Administration before the late happy Revolution, but*

6

I would

I would humbly ask, what share the *Passions* and *bad Designs* of Men can have in an effect that is owned to have been produced by length of Time, and by very *insensible Degrees*? Did designing Men lay a Plot a thousand Years ago to produce an insensible change in the sense of Words, to serve some wicked Purpose, which were not to take place till many Ages after they were gone off the Stage? I don't know which is the stranger of the two, to think Men capable of such Designs, or that they should be able to effect them. I leave it to his L<sup>ty</sup> to reconcile this, either to common Sense, or to his own Words.

His L<sup>ty</sup> having shewn what imminent Danger we are in from this great Evil, which is now at its Crisis, in the next place points out with a masterly Skill, the several Methods that ought to be pursued as the *only Cure for it*. He sends us to the *Originals of Things*, but does not tell us where they are to be found, then to the *Law of Reason*, which is still harder to be known, and is what every *Schoolist* is pleased to make it; useful Directions these for the illiterate Part of Mankind, whom his L<sup>ty</sup> has taken into his more immediate Protection; then we are sent to the *Declarations of JESUS CHRIST*. Thus his L<sup>ty</sup> excludes the whole Old Testament at once as useless to the Cure of this great Evil, which is very strange in a Writer, who had just before sent us to the *Originals of Things*. He adds, and his immediate Followers; who these are his L<sup>ty</sup> does not tell us, but I will suppose he meant to take in all the Writings that make up the New Testament, these then are to be consulted on such Matters as each *draws solely from these Declarations*. Was his L<sup>ty</sup> afraid we should recur too often to these Writings, that he puts such a Limitation

tation upon the use of them? If we ought to have recourse to them *in such Matters only as take their rise from those Declarations*, how comes his L——p to fetch from thence his Explications of *Religion, Prayer, the Worship and Love of God*? Do these take their rise solely from the Declarations of *Christ*, and his immediate Followers? Sure they are all of older date, have all a place in the *Law* and the *Prophets*, and are founded in Reason and the Light of Nature! Had I been in his L——p's Place, instead of *such Matters, &c.* I should have thought it much properer to have said, *in all Matters that any way concern us as we are Christians*. These are his L——p's Methods of Cure, but there is one very material thing, which he seems to have forgot, what helps we must use for the right understanding these *Declarations*, when in Obedience to his Directions we have recourse to them: This looks as if he thought there were no occasion for any, as if nothing were ambiguous or obscure in the Language of the New Testament, but all plain and easy to the meanest Understanding, as if he took the New Testament for a Treatise *de Usu Verborum*, or that no term were used, whose Sense was not first exactly settled and defined. For the Case, his L——p says, *is plainly this—— That the very same word remaining (which at first truly represented one certain thing)* I should be extremely obliged to his L——p, if he would give us a Catalogue of Words out of the New Testament, that in his Opinion represent but one certain thing, and do that truly. I have read the New Testament a little, and will take the liberty to tell his L——p, what seems to be as yet a Secret to him, that the sacred Books are not, as to the Style of them, writ either in the Elegancy of Oratory, or the exactness of Philosophy;



Iosophy; and if his L——p will review St. Paul's Epistles to the *Corinthians*, he will find that he owned himself *rude in Speech*, and was far from thinking it a Discredit to his Mission, that he did not come to them in the *Words of human Wisdom*. Well, but according to his L——p, the same Word by having multitudes of new inconsistent Ideas in every Age and every Year added to it, becomes it self the greatest Hindrance to the true understanding the Nature of the thing first intended by it. It would be a very entertaining Dissertation, if his L——p would in one or two Words only make an *Evolution*, and draw out into Array those Multitudes of Ideas (consistent or inconsistent I will not stand for) that have in Length of Time been added to it, and give us a *Chronological Series* in what Age and Year each Addition was made. I have heard of Multitudes of *Spirits* standing upon a Needle's Point, but never before of *Multitudes of Ideas* crowded into a single Word. Who can doubt, but that his L——p if he had not writ in great haste, would have expressed himself with more Justness, and not have transformed two or three different Senses of a Word, which are generally *analogous*, and easily accounted for, into *Multitudes of inconsistent Ideas*? If his L——p will please to consult those who have spent all their time in the Study of the learned Languages, and have laboured with greatest Success in clearing up the Ambiguity of Words, and fixing the various Senses of them, they will tell his L——p, that whoever have given him this extravagant Account, have greatly misinformed him.

His L——p having in this manner set forth the Evil he complains of, the Causes, Effects and Cures, comes next to illustrate what he has said in the four Instances I have already mentioned, *Religion*, the

*Worship of God, Prayer, and the Love of God*, all very improperly chosen, and all treated with the utmost Inaccuracy. For he has prepared his Readers to expect Instances of new Senses put upon old Words by Men of bad Designs, to lead the People into Mistakes of the worst Consequence, by which the Vitals of all that is good are affected, and these Mistakes so general and prevailing, that the *very Boundaries of right and wrong* are upon the Point of vanishing out of Sight. How now is this terrible Accusation made good? What Pretence is there for charging the Clergy of the Church of *England*, who have taught from the Pulpit and Press more good practical Divinity, than any other part of the Christian World does, or, I believe, ever did? What Pretence, I say, is there for charging the Clergy of the *establish'd Church* with seducing the People into fatal Errors in any one of these Instances? Or will his L——p say, he did not mean that the People were misguided in them by their Teachers here in *England*? If he will, what more need be said to shew how improper they were for the Audience he was preaching to? and how wide of the Mark he should have aimed at? But I have Reason to think his L——p too sincere, to say, he intended this heavy Charge for *foreign Countries* only. An unwary Reader might perhaps fancy his L——p meant only to lash the Corruptions of *Papery*; but they who observe how carefully he has avoided to name *Papery* through the whole Sermon, tho' he could not but have it perpetually in his Thoughts all the time he was writing, and are acquainted with the new Cant some Persons are so fond of, *viz. Protestant Papery*, (for every thing is *Papery* they don't like,) they who observe and know this, will easily see, his Lordship meant his own Countrey and his own Church, a Share in every

every part of his Charge; and indeed there is no Possibility of understanding his L——p otherwise, if we will suppose him to write pertinently. Here then are the Generality of the Writers of the Established Church arraigned of designedly seducing their Flocks in Matters of the greatest Concern to their Salvation; a heavy Charge, and at the same time so light, that there is not a Grain of Truth in it: And if I am not greatly mistaken, 'tis far from being true with respect to Popery it self, which needs not to be misrepresented, to make it more odious than it is. But let us suppose for once the Charge true, that the Teachers of the People have put the Change upon them, and palmed new Senses upon old Words; What has his L——p done to set the People right, and restore these Words to their true Sense?

Religion, his L——p says, in *St. James's Days* was *Virtue and Integrity as to our selves, and Charity and Beneficence to others, before God even the FATHER.* And does his L——p really think *St. James* intended in the Place referred to, to give a complete Definition of the Word *Religion*? Or that *Seiyonka*, which is the Word in the Original, is properly in its first and strict Sense the *Visitation of the Fatherless and Widows, and the Preservation of a Man's self from the Pollutions of the World*? *St. James's* Meaning is so plain, that he who reads the Context, cannot mistake him if he would. He is exhorting those he writes to, to be *Doers of the Word, and not Hearers only*, y. 22. For as he saith in the next Chapter, y. 14. *Faith alone cannot profit a Man without Works*; and therefore if a Man *bridle not his Tongue*, or offend in any other Point of what is commanded by God's Law, *that Man's Religion is vain*; he does not say he has no Religion, but that it will do him no good. Our Religion,



Religion, to be acceptable to God, must be *pure and undefiled*, and to make it such in the Sight of God, it must be accompanied with *Purity and Charity*. The Apostle therefore tells us in these Words, not what *Religion* is, but what is essential to it, to make it such as God will accept. But there are two other Things deserve our Observation in this Sentence of his L——p's; one is, that if this be a complete Definition of *Religion*, then the Belief of a future State is not necessary to a true Idea of Religion; the contrary of which is not only true of the *Christian Religion*, but in his L——p's Scheme is so essential to all Religion, that he has put upon that single Point great part of his Defence. Another thing I would observe, is, that his L——p has so perverted the Order of St. James's Words that they are hardly Sense, purely to force them into the Service of the new Doctrines. St. James does not say Religion is Virtue, and Charity before God; but that the Religion which is *pure and undefiled before God*, is this, to *visit*, &c. And it had been no way improper, if St. James had added, and *before our Lord Jesus Christ*, after the Example of St. Paul, who in his Epistles to Timothy has several times this Expression, *I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ*. Whatever his L——p may think, *ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦς* had been no more injurious to the Father's Supremacy, than *ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦς*, or than the *ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦς*, which we meet with so often in the Epistles. His L——p goes on thus, *By degrees it is come to signify in most Countries the Performance of almost every thing, except Virtue and Charity*. Tell us, my Lord, one such Country, where Christians are so ill taught, and by what Degrees this Alteration in the Sense of the Word was made. His L——p's Proof really proves the

contrary. *A punctual Exactness, in Times, Places, Forms and Modes, is recommended and practised under the agreed Name of EXTERNAL RELIGION.* His L——p, to prove his Point, should have said, under the Name of *pure and undefiled Religion in the sight of God.* But this was too absurd even for his L——p to affirm. He allows, 'tis called *external Religion*, which is as plain a Distinction as could be made, to prevent Peoples placing all Religion in Externals, which the Corruption of Mens own Hearts, not the bad Designs of their Teachers, make them too apt to do. But his L——p is highly offended at the Conjunction of these two Words; he declares *God has put them asunder.* I ask where, or rather do affirm, that he has done it no where. No Expression can be more proper, and God never separates what Reason joins. His L——p proceeds: *And accordingly the Notion of a religious Man differs in every Countrey, just as much as TIMES, PLACES, CEREMONIES, and IMAGINARY AUSTERITIES, &c. are different.* If his L——p would have writ consistently, he should have said, *and accordingly an external religious Man;* and even then there had been no Sense or Truth in his Observation: A Man *truly and internally religious*, means in all Countries a Man who serves God conscientiously, according to the best of his Knowledge, and the Religion he professes: And an *externally religious* Man is in all Countries one that observes the *Externals* of Religion, according to the Usage of the Church of which he is a Member. By the way, I believe his L——p would think these *imaginary Austerities*, were he to make the Tryal, very real ones; at least the Expression implies, that he thinks there are some such, which in a *Lent* Sermon it might have become his L——p to have recommended in some Degree as proper to that

that holy Season. His L——p adds, *Tho' a Man truly religious in other respects may make use of such Things, yet they cannot be the least part of his Religion, properly so called, any more than his Food, or his Raiment, or any other Circumstance of his Life.* With what Unfairness does his L——p shift his Terms? *External Religion, religious, truly religious*; the material Word that the Argument turns upon, is first dropp'd, then one of a contrary Nature is shuffled in; but these are little Things: 'Tis of more Moment to observe with what Contempt his L——p treats the *Rites and Ceremonies*, and all those *outward Acts of Religion*, without which publick Worship cannot subsist, *a Man truly religious may make use of them; ergo, may not; But I take leave to say, he must use them, 'tis the Duty of every Man to perform external as well as internal Worship; the Nature and Design of Religion, the Honour of God and Good of Men make it necessary.*

Thus his L——p has performed in his first Instance, and it were easy to shew, if it would not be too tiresome to the Reader, as well as my self, that he has succeeded no better in every part of the rest; all have in them the same Marks of Haste, and an Inaccuracy very ill becoming one who has taken the *Censor's Part*, and falls with so heavy a hand upon all in general, without Distinction or Exception. His second Instance is the *Worship of God, which was in our Saviour's Time the Worship of the FATHER in Spirit and in Truth.* What use now does his Lordship make of this? Why, *in many Christian Countries the Worship of God is indeed the Neglect and the Diminution of the FATHER, and the Worship of other Beings besides, and more than the FATHER.* Had his L——p meant this as a Reflection on Popish Countries only, 'tis not



not to be imagined he would not have said so, His L——p therefore in *his many Countries*, must be understood to include many Protestant Countries; but this is not in the least degree true of them, unless it be esteemed a *Diminution to the FATHER*, that they worship the Son also, which they do in Conformity to the *Catholick Church* of all Ages, and in Obedience to our Saviour's own Words, that Men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father. But this Doctrine his Lordship, it seems, does not like, as I have already hinted upon the first Instance, if he did, as hasty and inaccurate as I think he was, in penning this Sermon, *Jesus Christ* must have had some place in his Observations upon Religion, the *Worship of God*, and Prayer, which is his L——p's third Instance.

Prayer, he tells us, in all our Lord's Directions about it, was a CALM, UNDISTURBED ADDRESS TO GOD, under the Notion of a FATHER, expressing those Sentiments and Wishes before him, which every sincere Mind ought to have. That Prayer is an Address to God, is very true, and needs not the Authority of Scripture to prove it: What his L——p would have us learn from thence, is, that it is a calm and undisturbed Address. I dare say his L——p is the first, that ever thought that calm and undisturbed were Characteristics of Prayer, much less could any one without his L——p's Penetration, have deduced them from any Words of our Saviour. Calm and undisturbed are as proper to any other Acts of Religion, or of civil Life, as they are to Prayer, and were it otherwise, there is not the least tittle in Scripture to countenance his L——p's Assertion. We are there commanded to pray always, and not to faint, *μη ἐνυπναι* we read of instant and earnest Prayer, *ἐκλενὺς, ἐν ἐκλενέει*, of the Elect crying to God Day and Night, of our Saviour

Saviour himself offering up *Prayers and Supplications with strong Crying and Tears*; who recommends great *Importunity* in Prayer by a very remarkable Parable, to encourage us not to give over in Despair, if we are not presently heard. I say unto you, *though he will not rise and give him, because he is his Friend, yet because of his IMPORTUNITY, did ye & availeth him, he will rise and give him as many as he needs*, Luke xi. 8. And St. James exhorts us to pray for one another, because the *effectual fervent Prayer* of a righteous Man availeth much, *divine divine Evangelium* the force of which last Word 'tis hard to reach in a Translation. I would fain know from which of these Places, and by what Art his L——p extracted his *calm and undisturbed*? Does he really think such a Character the proper figure of a Person seeking to God for Help in Distress, or for Pardon under a sense of Sins? Does he think *calm and undisturbed* sat upon the Visage of the *Daughter of Sion*, when she cries out in the *Lamentations*, *Behold and see, if there be any Sorrow like unto my Sorrow; — Behold, O Lord, I am in Distress, my Bowels are troubled within me, for I have grievously rebelled? Was calm and undisturbed the Appearance of the Prophet Jeremiah, when he laments before God the Sins of his People in these pathetick Words, Ob that my Head were Water, and mine Eyes a Fountain of Tears, that I might weep Day and Night for the slain of the Daughter of my People? Did the Ideas of calm and undisturbed ever arise in his L——p's Mind upon reading the Prayers of Hezekiah, Ezra, Habakkuk or Daniel? Do these Words in any wise represent the Addressee of holy David to his God, with which the Book of *Psalms* is fill'd, who pours out his Complaints in the Anguish of his Soul, and watered his*

Couch

*Conch with Tears Day and Night?* I can't but wonder that his L——p should forget this Book when he was writing upon *Prayer*, since the *Christian Church* has always thought it an unvaluable Treasure of *Devotions*, and 'tis made a constant part of our own publick Service. But to set this in another Light, his L——p has seen, no doubt, a great many fine Paintings by the best Hands, I would therefore humbly ask, if he ever read *calm and undisturbed* in the Countenances of a *Madonna* or a *Magdalene* drawn at their Devotions by *Raphael, Titian, Caraccio*, or any other of those great Masters, who became such, by being great Masters of Nature, and by being able to give to every Action and Affection its proper Character? But this is the least Fault in his L——p's Account of *Prayer*, that *Devotion* and *Earnestness* have no part in it. There is not a Word of that Faith, on which the Scriptures put the Efficacy of Prayer, nor of *Jesus Christ*, who is our *Advocate*, our Mediator, our High Priest, in whose Name our Prayers by his own exprels Command are to be offered to the Father, and thro' whose Merit and Intercession they are accepted. If his Lordship had drawn his Account of Prayer from the Philosophers, *Ζεὺς βασιλεὺς τῶ μὴ ἰδῶν*, &c. I should have had nothing to except to it, but for a *Christian Bishop* to give us a Description of *Prayer*, in which there is nothing of Faith or of *Jesus Christ*, is, I confess, astonishing, and that at a time when he is undertaking to set us all right, and to give us true Notions of Things, in great Pity and Compassion to us, for the Ignorance and Delusion we are under.

In the last Place his L——p instances in *the Love of God and of our Saviour*, and would persuade us, the Love of him is nothing else but keeping



his Commandments, because our Saviour says, *If ye love me, keep my Commandments.* Strange Logick! The best Proof of the Sincerity of our Love of God is to keep his Commandments: therefore the keeping God's Commandments is a just and adequate Idea of the Love of God. If his L—p will read again St. John's first Epistle, he will find the Notion of the Love of God was not left so *je-june*, as he has represented it: but 'tis very strange his L—p should not for the Love of God send us to God's own Command about it, which requires a greater Degree of Love, than any other Words can well express, with *all the Heart, and Mind, and Soul, and Strength*: But this agrees so ill with his L—p's Account, that it was thought perhaps more prudent to omit it. 'Tis no new Observation upon his L—p, that he never thinks he opposes one Extreme enough, if he does not run himself into the other.

I have now done with his Lordship's Instances, when I have observed one thing common to them all, which is, that his L—p is totally mistaken, when he imputes the *Change of Sense* in each of them, to *gradual Alterations* made in several Ages, at a distance from our Saviour's Time; there being no one of them, which was not in and before our Saviour's Time, as liable to his L—p's Charge, as they are now: and the Reason is plain, for the Abuses of each of them arise either from the Superstition, or from the Corruption and Hypocrisy of Men. But the same Causes will in all Times produce the same Effects.

Such is his L—p's Introduction, in every part of it *very highly unbecoming*, to speak in his L—p's Language of the Lord Bishop of Oxford, p. 268. *A Bishop, a Divine and Scholar*, a heap of hasty Reflections, and rash Censures, just and true of the

Teachers of no Church, most unjust and false of the Clergy of the Church of England. His L—p's only Defence for this I take to be, that he writ in great Haste, and with as great Sincerity as is consistent with Non-Examination: for I verily believe, and hope his Readers will have Candour enough to believe so too, that his L—p has not offended against Knowledge.

But let us see now what End this mighty *Apparatus* is to serve. His L—p has raised the Attention of his Reader to the Height, and prepared him to expect strange Discoveries of the *Abuses* of the Word Church, a History of the gradual *Alterations* made in the true Sense of it, and a Catalogue of the many *bad Designs* they were calculated for; in short, that he would lay open a horrid Scene of *Priestcraft*, which hath confounded the *Boundaries* of right and wrong, and touched the *Vitals* of all that is good; and then, produce an *infallible Cure* for the greatest of Evils, and fix the standard, genuine Sense of this important Word in such a manner, as to put it out of the Power of the Clergy, or the *Magistrate* to abuse it any longer: We are made to expect nothing less than a sovereign Antidote for the most ignorant, against the Delusions imposed on them by their Priests, and an effectual Security for all Persons from the Power assumed by the Magistrate in Matters of Religion. All this we expect, but expect in vain! And this long Introduction is really an Introduction to nothing, but this one extravagant Assertion, that the *Notion of the Church of CHRIST* has since his time been so diversified by the various *Alterations* it hath undergone, that it is almost impossible so much as to number up the many inconsistent Images that have come by daily Additions to be united together in it. Images, various, inconsistent, numberless! All this we are to believe upon his

L——p's bare Word. In p. 5. he speaks of *inconsistent Ideas added every Age and every Year*; I wonder'd at his Moderation, in not adding, *and every Day*. His L——p has here supplied that Defect, and tells us, *daily Additions* have been made to the Notion of the Church, inconsistent with it, and with one another; now every Tittle of this may be false, for any thing his L——p has said to prove it true. What must a sober Man and a Scholar think, to see a *Christian Bishop* arraign in this manner all the Churches in the *Christian World*, without the least Proof for what he says? For his Accusation takes in *Protestants* as well as *Papists*, and the Church of *England* as well as any other. For if his L——p did not intend to fix this Charge on the *Protestant Churches*, why did he not except them? If the Church of *England* was not to be included in the Accusation, why did he not vouchsafe to take some Notice of that grave, and plain, and honest Definition of the *Church*, which is given us in the *Articles*? "Where 'tis said to be a  
 " Congregation of faithful Men, in which the  
 " pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacra-  
 " ments be duly ministred according to Christ's  
 " Ordinance, in all those things that of Necessity  
 " are requisite to the same". Who were to preach and administer, is declared in another Article. In Charity to his L——p, I am willing to believe, that he spoke without Book, and neither looked into the *Corpus Confessionum* to see the Sense of *foreign Protestants*, nor once thought of our own *Articles*: If he had done either, so groundless a Charge could not possibly have come from one of his L——p's great Meekness and Integrity. Well, since we must not have the Pleasure to see those many *false Images* of the *Church* exposed as they should have been, we may hope at least for the Satisfaction



satisfaction of seeing the true Image of the Church  
 set forth in its primitive and first Beauty, stripped  
 of all the false Additions which in succeeding  
 Times it has been defaced with. And his L—p has  
 indeed stripped it of all Additions, and left it so na-  
 ked, that it is really *rudis indigestaque moles*, a *prima*  
*materia*, not only without *Comlinefs*, but without  
*Form*: 'Tis, he says, *the Number of those who believe*  
*Christ to be the Messiah*; that is, the *Messiah* to be  
 the *Messiah*. By this admirable Definition any Num-  
 ber of Men who assent to these two Words, are as  
 truly the *Church of Christ*, as any other Number;  
 and every Number may subsist in a way agreeable  
 to the Will of *Christ*, without Governors or Mi-  
 nisters; an *instituted Religion* has no *Institutions*  
 necessary to it; and nothing is to be done in the  
 Church by any Body, but what may as well be  
 done by every Body: Nor are any *Creeds*, or any  
*Forms* necessary, not the shortest *baptismal Creed*,  
 not the Form of *Baptism* in the Name of the Fa-  
 ther, Son, and Holy Ghost; nothing is necessary but  
 to believe *Christ*, (he should have said *Jesus*) to be  
 the *Messiah*. And in this it must be confessed his  
 L—p follows great Masters, the *Leviathan*, and  
 the Author of *the Rights*, besides some others,  
 who are known Enemies to *Creeds*, and the Faith  
 taught in them, which they would reduce into  
 one Article, as the most effectual way to sink all  
*revealed Religion* into what they call *natural*, and  
 bring down Christianity to mere *Deism*, which  
 shall be just what they please to make it. This  
 made them so fond of this Doctrine of *one Article*,  
 in which as they followed no Christian Bishop, so  
 no Christian Bishop before his L—p has followed  
 them. But to examine into the true Sense of this  
*one Article*, which it might be more excusable in  
 the *Leviathan*, &c. not to do, does his L—p  
 consider,

consider, what a Complication of Ideas is contained in the Word *Messiah*? Does he consider, it includes all that was foretold of him in the ancient Prophecies? Does he consider, that the *Messiah* was from the Beginning believed to be the *Son of God*? Does he remember, that St. *John* makes the Belief of this essential to the Being of a *Christian*, and that he therefore wrote his Gospel, *that Men might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing they might have Life through his Name*? Does not this same Apostle tell us, that this Son of God was the *Word*, or *Logos* made *Flesh*, and that this *Logos* was in the Beginning with God, and was God, and that all Things were made by him? Does not the same Apostle style him on this Account the only begotten Son of God, *ὁὐ μόνος υἱός*; And is not this Expression a part of the shortest Creed that ever was used by *Christians*, who have thereby declared the Belief of the divine Generation of the Son, to be an essential Article of Faith? All this therefore is necessarily included, besides many other Articles, in believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*.

But there is another thing very observable in this Definition, in which I know not whom his L—p follows. He drops a Word, which has always been thought necessary to it, and substitutes another in the room of it, which is by no means of the same Import; the Church with him is not a *Congregation*, or *Company* of Men, *Coetus Fidelium*, which implies Unity, but a *Number* only, by which the Reader loses sight of that *Union* which is essential to the Constitution of a Church. But this I am sensible must not be imputed to any Inaccuracy in his L—p, nor indeed any other Defect that there may seem to be in this Definition: For if there be any two Lines in the whole Sermon

more better considered than the rest, we may be sure they are these, which are laid down to be as it were the Basis of the *Babel Scheme*. His L<sup>o</sup>p therefore with great Judgment declines to use the Word *Congregation*, or any other of like Import, that might make the Church be taken for a Society, lest the Reader should from thence be led to think it had some Resemblance to other Societies, and by consequence had its Governors, a Consequence to be abhorred by all good Men who are in his L<sup>o</sup>p's Sentiments.

As this Alteration of the *Catholic Language* in the Definition of the Church, is made not through Haste but with Design, so every one of the Omissions I have observed in it, must be allowed to have its End. The last of them is to strike off all other Articles of Faith from being made Terms of Communion; the second, to remove all Obligation to the Observance of stated *Forms and Ceremonies* in that publick Worship; that every one who calls himself a Christian, may be indulged all the Privileges of Church-Communion, without conforming to any regular Administration of the Sacraments, or to the Use of the Sacraments themselves. But the first Omission is the principal, being of most use to secure the other two. For if there be no *Ministers* appointed by *Christ* for the well governing of his Church, they have then no more Authority to teach, or censure, or prescribe, than what the present Humour of the People will please to give them; there is an end of all spiritual Discipline, and they may be laid aside at Pleasure. And thus there is an end of those *Creed-making Priests*, who are such an Offence to some of his L<sup>o</sup>p's great Admirers. Nor will those who are in his L<sup>o</sup>p's Sentiments allow the *Civil Magistrate* to supply the want of that Authority, which



is denied to them; for they loudly declare, and without Ceremony, that Matters of Religion are not within his Province.

That his L——p did intend to make his Definition of the Church thus easy to all sorts of People, making a bare Profession of the Name of *Christ*, the thing speaks it self: But that I may not be charged with imputing to his L——p Designs he does not own, I leave it to the Reader to judge of the Definition by the Use that is made of it, and the Doctrine 'tis adapted to. But before I take Leave of it, I cannot but observe with some Surprise, that as carefully as it seems to have been considered, there is one thing not in it which was most to be expected, nothing of the Church's being a *Kingdom*, which yet in the following Discourse is made the very Essence of it. Which makes me suspect that this Definition was not first made now, but was an old one his L——p kept by him in *Petto*: For had it been made now, his L——p would rather have said, that the Church was the Number of those who believed *Christ to be their King*, than to be the *Messiah*. This would have made it still more agreeable to his L——p's Argument, and the Doctrine 'tis to serve, which is this, *that in the Church of Christ no Person or Persons have an absolute Authority to make Laws, or interpret, or judge in Affairs of Conscience, and eternal Salvation, and that no Christians absolutely, indispensably, implicitly, blindly, without Consideration, and without Examination, are bound to obey the DECISIONS of Men in these Points.* In which Assertion there is no Obscurity, except in those Words, *Affairs of Conscience, and eternal Salvation*; which elsewhere is expressed by *Matters relating to the Favour of God, and their eternal Salvation.* Which Words I either don't understand,

stand, or they take in every thing that can be thought of, except such Matters as in their Nature are perfectly indifferent. And even those too, if the Persons to whom they are enjoined shall take it into their Heads, that they are not indifferent. However this Limitation which his L—p has put, though upon his Principles it really ends in nothing, necessarily supposes the Church he is speaking of, to be the *visible* Church, 'tis that therefore of which his Definition must be understood, and the Church, as it is *invisible*, is quite out of the Question.

This then is his L—p's *Nostrum*, the grand Secret which wanted so large an Introduction. 'Tis this all our Expectations end in. His L—p is to be esteemed the great Deliverer and Restorer of the human Understanding from the Slavery of Priestcraft; for daring to deny and disprove a *Stupid, senseless* Assertion, which no Church, I believe no Man, was ever *went* or *wicked* enough to affirm. I know *Papery* is to bear all, but if his L—p knew more of it than he seems to do, he would know how to distinguish between the *Court* of Rome, and the *Church* of Rome; and would not want to be told, that several Parts of the *Romish* Church have vigorously opposed the Tyranny of the *Papacy*, and the *absolute, unlimited, blind* Obedience it requires of them. But whatever any particular Writers of the *Church* of Rome may have said, till his L—p produces an Instance from some one of them, I shall never believe that any, even of that Church, will own the Foundling in the Fool's Coat, in which his L—p has dressed it up.

But whatever the *Pope's* Creatures may say in Defence of his pretended *absolute, unlimited* Authority,

rity; what is this to the *Reformed Churches*, and  
 in particular to the *Church of England*? Has she  
 any where claimed such an Authority, or have her  
 Writers done it for her? Has not his L——p, in  
 his Answer to Dr. *Snape*, roundly declared, *that he,*  
*(the Doctor) indeed all, even every Man of the*  
*Church of England, come into the same Condemnation*  
*with him, if it be a Crime to deny in any Persons, in*  
*Matters of Conscience, an absolute Authority, to which*  
*a blind, implicate Obedience, is indispensably due?*  
*As he disclaims and disdains himself any such Claim,*  
*so does, he believes, every one of his Brethren, that*  
*what he maintains is the very Principle of the Prote-*  
*stant Church of England, as well as the Ground-*  
*work of the whole REFORMATION.* These are plain  
 Declarations, that even his L——p being Judge,  
 no Member of the *Church of England* does or can  
 affirm, what he is at so much Pains to deny. I  
 must own I am not sure what his L——p means  
 by his *Protestant Church of England*, because I  
 know but one; and I remember his L——p else-  
 where says, the *Church of England, truly so call'd;*  
 this is such a way of speaking, as justly creates a  
 Suspicion of some secret Meaning in it. As a Man  
 would with good Reason be suspected of Disaffe-  
 ction to his Majesty, and to mean the Pretender,  
 who in speaking of the King should affect to say,  
 the King of *England, truly so called.* But I have  
 such an Opinion of his L——p's Sincerity, that I  
 would rather think these Additions an Exuberance  
 of Style, than a Suppression of his real Sentiments.

Thus his L——p opposes with great Pomp,  
 what by his own Confession no body maintains. Be  
 it so; is not any Man at Liberty to defend a Truth  
 because it is allowed and confessed to be a Truth?  
 Yes, no doubt, his L——p may if he please, not  
 only declare in very strong and solemn Terms that



two and two make four, but may farther make an elaborate and large Proof of it. But if he should, he must give his Readers leave to smile a little, to see a Man of Figure and Learning take so much Pains about so plain a thing, and then value himself upon it, as if it were a great Discovery. But that is not all, his L——p does not only take much Pains to prove *nothing*, which would only be diverting his Readers at his own Expence, which he has an undoubted Liberty to do, but at the same time casts *odious Colours* upon the whole Body of *Protestant Churches*, and the *Protestant Church of England* in particular, as if the contrary to what his L——p asserts, were the current Doctrine of all or most of them. A Man may make as free as he will with himself, but I know no Right he has to do so with others: His L——p does more than insinuate in his Sermon, and in his Defences of it, that all Churches do in *Deed*, tho' not in *Word*, assume to themselves the Authority he is opposing, and in truth if he did not think so, it would be hard to see what Sense there can be in such an affected Opposition. But 'tis time to see how his L——p executes his grand Design, and how he proves the Church has not this absolute Authority. Now for this, he chuses a Text in which he supposes the Church is represented under the *Image of a Kingdom*, for doing which he gives this Reason, *that it hath not been so much used, and consequently not so much defaced*. 'Tis true, it has not been so much used, but the Reason is, because it is of all others the most improper, and the most liable to be abused, in truth no Scripture Image of the Church has been perverted to so ill Purposes, or in the Nature of it could be. And his L——p might from the Apostles never arguing from it, easily have concluded one of these two Things, either that it is really no

Image of the Church, or that the ill Uses it might be wrested to, make it safer to use any other. We need but go back to the late Times of *Confusion* to see the Truth of this, when this Image of the *Kingdom* was made the Firebrand to inflame the Minds of the People with a mad Zeal, and bewitch them into the wildest Sedition and most extravagant Enthusiasm. How his L<sup>ty</sup> came not to be aware of this, who no doubt is well read in our *English* History, and particularly in that of these Times, I know not, but if he had reflected on those Times but a very little, I should think it must have cured him of his Fondness for this Image, as well as of an *unbounded* Liberty in these Matters, which he would fain have try'd for this Reason, because it never has been try'd; which were it true, is in my humble Opinion, a very good Reason why it never should. 'Tis dangerous making Experiments in Government; and as no Prince, who was a Friend to Christianity, has been weak enough to do it yet, so I trust none ever will: But what his L<sup>ty</sup> would have try'd, has been try'd, sufficiently at least ~~in~~ Experiment. The Times of *Rebellion* were Times of the utmost *Confusion*, not only in *Civil*, but *Religious* Matters. There was in some part of those Times full Liberty for all Persuasions, every body did what was right in his own Eyes, which produced such an innumerable Spawn of absurd Sects, such a Medley of wild, senseless, prophane, impious, abominable Heresies, that in a little time they grew sick of the Liberty they were so fond of, and were most of them glad to return to some Order and Government in *Church*, as well as *State*. Thither therefore I would humbly refer his L<sup>ty</sup>, to see in a true Mirror the Effects of the Liberty he so warmly contends for.

But

But to return, his L——p in Terms opposes only *absolute Authority*, and to this end he will have the true Image of the Church to be the Image of a *Kingdom*; and this he thinks he finds in our Saviour's Answer to *Pilate*, Joh xviii, 36. where to clear himself of the Treason charged on him, as if he had assumed the Imperial Authority, he defends himself by declaring, *that his Kingdom is not of this World*. From hence his L——p infers that *Christ is King*, therefore no one else is; therefore he has no *Viceregent*, (which indeed he could not have if he were not King) therefore no one has Authority to make Laws, to interpret Laws, or to judge, and punish the Violation of them; therefore not to use any *negative Discouragements*; therefore *Dissenters*, of all Denominations, from the Church, have Right to all Places, that would put it in their power to destroy the Church, and to establish themselves, which no one ever thought they wanted Inclination to do; they are too sincere to say the contrary, and have too much Sense to expect to be believed, if they did.

But all this Train of Deductions is Amusement only, the Foundation is Sand, and the whole Superstructure may be blown away with the least puff of Wind; and his L——p might have deduced the same Consequences just as well from the first Verse in *Genesis*, as from this Text in *St. John*, *In the Beginning God made the Heavens and the Earth*, what then? why, therefore he is by the most incontestable Title *King* of all the World, therefore *sole King*, therefore there is no other, therefore no *Viceregent*, no *Law-maker*, no *Interpreter*, *Judge*, and so on; All are equally his *Subjects*, and no one has any Right to lord it over others. I do not see why this Argument is not as good as his L——p's, for what Commission have the Kings of



of the Earth from God, to call themselves his *Vicegerents* or *Ministers*? Will his L——p say, that it was by common Consent, and for the Good of *civil* Society, (and therefore agreeable to the Will of God) that Governments were erected, and that such and such Degrees of Submission are paid to them? And might I not as well say, that by the common Consent of *Christians*, Government was introduced into the Church for the Good of the Society *Christian*? But I don't put the Defence of *Church* Authority upon this Foundation, but upon what is much stronger, an expresse Commission from our Saviour to his Apostles and their Successors, to which end he has promised *his Spirit should be with them to the end of the Word*; John xiv. 16. Mat. xxviii. 20. This Commission the *Christian* World has hitherto acknowledged, and will go on to acknowledge, and their Adversaries will never by the Force of Argument be able to extort from them the Belief of it.

But to come to Particulars, his L——p having taken a Text nothing to his Purpose, and through a long Introduction made his way at last to it, proceeds to the Uses he intends to make of it thus *As the Church of Christ is the Kingdom of Christ, he himself is King*. An accurate Writer, if he were not press'd in time, (which I always suppose throughout these Remarks to have been his L——p Case) though he had not set out with so much Pomp, nor prepared his Reader to expect Wonders, as his L——p has done, would first, to explain what is meant by the *Kingdom*, have considered the Context, and shewn the precise Meaning of the Text, as it stands in Conjunction with it; nor would he have stopped here, but would have observed the frequent Use of the like Expression in the other Gospels, and at the same time have

have taken Notice how very seldom this Expression occurs in the *Epistles*, and have given his Hearers the Reason of this, what it was that made this Language proper in the first Publication of the Gospel to the *Jews*, but not so in the Preaching of it to the *Gentiles*: It would certainly have been extremely proper for his L——p to have explain'd at large and with Care, an Expression that makes so great a part in the three first Gospels; and which from the fourth (of all the least proper for his Purpose) is made the Foundation of his whole Argument.

His L——p no doubt was in too much Haste to consult Texts which requires Time; which I take to be the Reason, that in the whole Prosecution of an Argument built on Scripture, we find but one single Text made use of, and that misquoted and misapplied? It was much easier for his L——p, in the Hurry he was in, to take another Method, and to have no regard to the Context, much less to other places of Scripture, which might help his Readers either to understand the Scripture, or his own Argument. Immediately therefore, instead of this, his L——p puts upon them a Change of Terms, and takes it for granted, the the *Kingdom of Christ* is the *Church of Christ*: For this, though of so much Importance to his Subject, his L——p expects to be believed upon his bare Word, and mere Authority, which is something surprizing in one who denies all Authority to others, and that at the very time he is doing it. His L——p does not reflect himself, and concludes his Hearers will not, that such an Explanation makes his Text not to be Sense. But let that pass, whether the Kingdom in Scripture be the Church, or not, I leave to be disputed between his L——p and the Dean of *Worcester*. I will suppose

suppose for once it is, and that his L—p's Text is in these Terms, *my Church is not of this World*. Had these been the Terms, his L—p, suitably to his Introduction, should first have defined and explained what is meant by *Church*, and settled the true Meaning of this Term to prevent all Mistakes; and if it be used in *Scripture* variously, he should have told us what the several Senses are, and in which of them, and for what Reasons, it was to be taken here. This had naturally been his first Business: In the next place, his L—p should have considered what it is that is affirmed of this *Church*, what is meant by its not being of *this World*. And as this is Language peculiar to St. John's Gospel, his L—p should have shown from the Context, and other Places where the same Expression occurs, what is intended to be understood by it.

When his L—p had in this manner settled the Meaning of the Terms of his Text, then had been the proper time for him to shew what Inferences or Characters of the *Church*, by just and natural Consequence, agreeably to our Saviour's Intention, and the Analogy of Scripture, follow from it. This, in my humble Opinion, had been the true way of treating this Text, which is so very obvious, that a Person of his L—p's great Genius could not have missed it, had the Text been before him when he made this Sermon, and he had had the least leisure to consider calmly and sedately the true Meaning and Extent of it. For I will not suppose his L—p was conscious that his Text, rightly explain'd, was nothing to his Purpose, and for that Reason declined the Explication. This, I say, had been the natural and proper Method; whereas in that his L—p takes, every thing is preposterous and out of order. He takes

for



or granted; first, that the Kingdom is the Church; and then proceeds, as if the Text had run thus, *My Church is my Kingdom, and my Kingdom is not of this World*, as 'tis expressed by his L—p himself, pl 17. Having thus substituted two Propositions in the room of one in the Text, his L—p immediately comes to his Deductions or Inferences from them, and gives us first those which in his Opinion follow from the first of them. He begins with this, *as the Church of Christ is the Kingdom of Christ, He himself is King; and in this it is implied, that He is himself the sole LAW-GIVER to his Subjects, and himself the sole JUDGE of their Behaviour in the Affairs of CONSCIENCE and eternal SALVATION*; and from hence to the end of the Sermon, we hear of nothing but the Laws of Christ. When his L—p had made so long an Introduction, and given this Reason for it, *to shew the Necessity there is to go back to the New Testament itself*, one might have hoped to have found in the Sequel of his Discourse, at least the Language of the New Testament, if not the Sense of it; but in Fact it proves quite otherwise. And this favourite Expression of his L—p's, which we meet with in every Page, and almost every Sentence in the Sermon, is not once to be found in Scripture, where we have frequent Mention of Christ's Precepts and Instructions, but never of his Laws. This is the first Consequence of the Image he has chosen for the Church, that it has drawn him into Language the Scriptures know nothing of, which gives one little Hopes of finding Scripture Notions under it. But let us examine the Argument, as the Church is the Kingdom, Christ is the King. That Christ is King, is readily allowed; but then his Kingdom is not confined to the Church. All Power, he says himself, is given to him in Heaven and in Earth

*Earth.* But for once I will make his L——p this Concession; What follows from it? Why, that he is *sole King* and *sole Law-giver*, and therefore *no one else is King or Law-giver*. 'Tis very indulgent in his L——p to allow *Christ* to be either *King*, or *Law-giver*; for if his Argument be good, one might by the Force of it deny of him what his L——p denies of those who govern the Church under him. For the *Scripture* says expressly, that God is the *sole Potentate*, the *sole King*, and *sole Law-giver*; see 1 *Tim.* i. 17. v. 17. and *Jam.* iv. 12. In which last place 'tis said, *there is one Law-giver who is able to save and to destroy* Εἷς ἐστιν ὁ νομοδότης which, I think, is meant of the *Father*: But I will give his L——p his Choice if it be meant of the *Son*, then the *Father* is excluded; or else one Person may be said to be the *sole King* and *Law-giver*, and yet notwithstanding that Restriction, the same Terms, though not exactly in the same Sense, may be applied to another. What inclines me to the first Sense, is, that the *Evangelists* never give this Title to *Christ*; nor in his Precepts, as I have already observed, ever called *Laws* in the New Testament, nor his Gospel a Law in the Singular Number; either by himself or any of the *Evangelists*, and not above once or twice in the Epistles; and then 'tis rather in Allusion to the *Law*, than by a strict Propriety of Speech. And as fond as his L——p is of making the Church a Kingdom, and of *Christ's* giving Laws to it, the *Scriptures* know no such Relation, 'tis the *Body of Christ* and *Spouse of Christ* but not the *Kingdom of Christ*; 'tis not so much called his *House*, but the *House of God*; and indeed rarely called the Church of *Christ*, but the *Church of God in Christ*. All which shews that God is the *supreme King and Law-giver*, and *Christ* is neither

but as under him. And by a like Gradation those Titles may belong to others under Christ.

But his L—p goes on, *in these Points he hath left behind him no visible human Authority*. Which seems to be a plain Concession, that in other Points he hath left behind him a *visible human Authority*, from whence I infer, first, that it is allowed by him, that there is in the Church a *visible Authority*, therefore the Church his L—p is here speaking of is a *visible Church*, since a *visible Authority* in an *invisible Church* is a manifest Contradiction. But farther, in these Words the *Authority* his L—p has left to the Church in some Points, is the same *Authority* that he has denied in these; therefore he has left to the Church in some Points a *visible, absolute Authority*, since 'tis an *absolute Authority* only in these Points he has denied. But here again I give his L—p his Choice; for if *Christ* has left to his Church only a *limited Authority* in other Things, but has not left in these, the *Authority* he has left in them; it will follow, that in these Points he has left no *Authority* at all; therefore not *absolute Authority* only, but all *Authority* is by his L—p denied in them. And this, I confess, I take to be his L—p's true Meaning, because in Page 16. the Word *absolute*, and all his other restraining Epithets are dropped; and he declares, *that all Christ's SUBJECTS, in what Station soever they may be, are equally SUBJECTS to Him; and that no one of them, any more than another, hath AUTHORITY either to make NEW LAWS for CHRIST's Subjects, or to impose a Sense upon the OLD ones, which is the same thing; or to judge, censure, or punish, the Servants of ANOTHER MASTER, in Matters relating purely to CONSCIENCE or SALVATION*. Here all *Authority* is plainly denied to the Church, and not only such as is *absolute*.



This Denial is indeed limited here to Matters relating purely to *Conscience*: But that is a Limitation in Appearance only; for the most indifferent Things become Matters of *Conscience*, when any one shall fancy they are not indifferent. And what confirms me in thinking this to be his L—p's Sense, is, that there is not one express Reservation of any Authority, in any Degree whatsoever, through the whole Sermon; and that agreeably to this, his L—p has somewhere undertaken, to prove that there is no *Medium* between *absolute* Authority and *no* Authority; and therefore in opposing what is *absolute*, he may very justly be presumed to deny all, and to leave to Church Governors no Right to any Obedience from those under their Care, because they have no Right to what is *implicite*, *blind*, *absolute*, and *unlimited*. But if this Argument be conclusive against Church Governors, 'tis as much so against our Civil Governors; for they have not an absolute Authority, (at least not in a limited Monarchy) and therefore by his L—p's Argument have none at all. From whence I cannot but conclude, that this Notion was some time since as *new* to his L—p himself, as it is still to his Readers; I mean when he was writing his *Measures of Submission*, in which he contends with so much Warmth, that the most *absolute* Authority is not strictly absolute, but necessarily has its Limitations.

His L—p proceeds thus: *Because Christ is sole King, and Law-giver and Judge, — therefore he hath left no VICEGERENTS, who can be said properly to supply his Place; no INTERPRETERS, upon whom his Subjects are absolutely to depend; no Judges over the Consciences, and Religion of his People.* The Reason is, because the Kingdom of *Christ* would then be no longer his Kingdom. It may be true, that *Christ* has left no  
such

such Persons, but, I think, not by Virtue of his L——p's Arguments: It would be a strange Conclusion, if we were speaking of any other King, to infer from his being so, that there was therefore no *Interpreter*, no *Judge*. The contrary would be the natural Conclusion; there is a King, therefore there are *Interpreters* and *Judges* under him. But his L——p supposes such a perpetual Contradiction between this and other Kingdoms, that what is Sense, speaking of them must for that Reason be Nonsense, if applied to this.

But farther, if his L——p's Argument be good for any thing, it will affect the *Apostles* themselves, and they must not be allowed to be *Interpreters* or *Judges*, any more than their Successors, for *Christ* is sole *Law-giver*, and sole *Judge*; therefore no one else, therefore not the *Apostles*. Afterwards indeed his L——p mends his Argument, so as to have a *Salvo* for the *Apostles*, thus, *Christ*, says he, *never interposeth since his first Promulgation of his LAW, either to convey INFALLIBILITY to such as pretend to handle it over again, or to assert the true INTERPRETATION of it.* I would gladly know, to what Point of Time his L——p fixes this first Promulgation of *Christ's* Law, how many Years it takes in after his Ascension, and by whom, exclusively to all others, it was made; and whether it continued incomplete till all the Books and Epistles that compose the New Testament, were writ, and put together, just so long, and no longer, and whether the Gospel was preached, and Churches planted by others besides the *Apostles*, and with the like Authority. It will be said perhaps, that the *Apostles*, and those commissioned by them, were extraordinarily assisted by the Spirit of God. I grant it, but was not the same Spirit which was given to them, given to the Church, to lead it  
into

into all Truth, and to continue with it to the End of the World, and till Christ's coming again? To lead, I say, not to compel and force the Teachers of the Word into all Truth, but gently to guide them; which Guidance 'tis certain the Ministers of the Gospel may, and often do resist; but if they are not wanting to the *Spirit*, the *Spirit* will not be wanting to them. And the Governors of the Church, if they act in the Fear of God, and under the Guidance of his Spirit, and take due Care not to deceive, or be deceived, may be as sure not to err in their Decisions, as if they were *infallible*. But necessarily *infallible* it must be acknowledged they are not; therefore they cannot be *Law-makers*, *Judges* or *Interpreters*, absolutely and properly, though such an Authority should be allow'd to the *Apostles*.

But I find I have mistaken his L——p before I was aware; there is no occasion for a *Salvo* to preserve to the Apostles the Authority which is here denied to their Successors. For if *Christ* interposeth, then 'tis *his* Authority, not *theirs*. And 'tis very true indeed, that all *derived* Authority is originally *his*, from whom it is derived. Hard is the Fortune of those whom *Christ* hath appointed to be his Ministers; qualified, or not qualified, they must pretend to no Authority; if not qualified, we are all ready to say they have none; if qualified, his L——p declares, 'tis *Christ's* Authority, not *theirs*. A strange Kingdom! in which 'tis not possible for *Almighty* Power, in the Absence of the King to appoint *Viceregents*, *Judges*, or *Interpreters*, such as are truly and properly such. But does his L——p consider, that by this way of arguing it will follow, that *Christ* himself had no Authority, for his also was *derived*; and when we obey his Commands, we obey them in his L——p's Language.



guage, not because they are *his*, but God's. 'Tis I know not by what Fate the Misfortune of his L——p's Arguments in this Controversy, that they generally prove too much.

But to return to the grand Argument, how strange is it to see a Person of his L——p's great Judgment, lay the most solid Foundation for *Viceregents, Interpreters, and Judges*, in order to prove that there neither are, nor can be any. Here is a *Kingdom and Laws*, which necessarily suppose *Government*, the King absent, and never interposing himself: Let but his L——p's Readers be thoroughly persuaded of this, and they will not ask his leave to conclude, that there certainly are *Viceregents, Interpreters, and Judges*, the very thing he would have them not believe: For a *Kingdom*, and no *Government*; a *King* absent, and no *Deputy*; *Laws*, and none to interpret; *Subjects*, and no *Judges* of their Behaviour, These are *Paradoxes*, that will not easily pass upon vulgar Understandings, whose Instruction it is, his L——p chiefly aims at; for which Reason I can't but think, his L——p's Image of a *Kingdom*, the most unhappy he could have chosen: From which he might have proved full as well, not that there are no *Kings* in Christ's Kingdom, but that in truth all are so; for the same St. John has expressly told us, that *Christ* hath made us all *Kings*, as well as *Priests*, unto God, and his Father, Apoc. i. 6. Nor did his L——p want a Text to prove all Christians *Judges*; For, know ye not, says St. Paul, that the *Saints* shall judge the *World*? 1 Cor. vi. 2. and from the same Apostle he might have shewn, that these *Saints*, who are to judge the *World*, are exempt from all *Laws* themselves: For 'tis said 1 Tim. i. 9. *δικαίω νόμος ἡ ἡμετέρας* that the *Law* is not made for the *Righteous*. His L——p's Image of a *Kingdom*

dom might have led him to these and many more such pretty Thoughts, as well as to those he has with so much Zeal and Concern deduced from it.

After having demolished all *Viceregents, Judges and Interpreters*, his L——p goes on thus: *It is the same thing as to Rewards and Punishments in Matters of Religion; because if any Men upon Earth have a RIGHT to add to the SANCTIONS of his Laws, that is, to increase the Number, or alter the Nature of the REWARDS and PUNISHMENTS of his Subjects in Matters of Conscience or Salvation, they are so far KINGS in his stead, reign in THEIR OWN Kingdom, not in His.* In which Words I must confess I do not well know either what the Charge is, or where in the Crime of it consists. What it is to add Sanctions to those already enacted, whether of the same or of another Nature, I can understand; but not what it is to *alter the Nature* of the Rewards and Punishments of *Christ's Subjects*. These Rewards and Punishments are those of another World; how the Nature of them can be altered while they remain, or who can take them away and substitute others in their room, or pretend to it, I am persuaded his L——p knows as little as I do; but to enforce the Laws of Christ by *temporal* Sanctions is very intelligible, and to my Understanding very lawful. The Laws of every State, when they are not concerning Things indifferent, if they are righteous Laws, add *new* Sanctions to the Laws of God: Every Law made to promote Virtue and discourage Vice, does this; which is so far from being a Fault in Governors, that *St. Paul* tells us, 'tis the great End of their Institution, they are the Ministers of God for the *Punishment of evil Doers, and for the Praise of them that do well.* Now how that comes to be a Crime in the Governors of the *Church*, which is so commendable in those of the State,

State, I would be glad to know. His L——p  
lays the Blame of it upon this, that they who do  
so, are *so far KINGS in his stead, and reign in THEIR  
OWN Kingdom, and not in His.* Does his L——p  
by these Words mean to insinuate, that they in  
this *usurp upon Christ*, invade his Prerogative, and  
take his Kingdom out of his Hands, which are his  
L——p's Words at the end of this Paragraph?  
The Words do not expressly say this; for he that  
*usurps the Kingdom of Christ*, reigns in his King-  
dom, not his own; whereas his L——p says, *they  
reign in THEIR OWN Kingdom, not in His.* But  
the foregoing Words are, *they are so far KINGS in  
his stead*; which implies a dethroning him, and ru-  
ling in his place. Either this is his L——p's Mean-  
ing, or it is not: If not, what is the Crime? If it  
be, how does he make it out? Strip the Sense of  
the new Language in which 'tis dress'd, and 'tis  
no more than this. That if the *Ministers of Christ*,  
and the Governors of the Church, (whoever they  
be) endeavour to reinforce his Laws by additional  
Censures and Sanctions, they do thereby take the  
Government of his Church out of his Hands, and  
place it in their own. Now how pursuing the  
Ends of Christ's Government, and endeavouring to  
give a greater Efficacy to his Laws in Subordina-  
tion to him, and in Discharge of the Trust com-  
mitted to them, is taking the Government out of  
his Hands, or what other Crime there can be in it,  
is, I confess, to me perfectly unintelligible. But I  
shall have Occasion to say more of this presently.

Thus far I have been following his L——p,  
while he has been wandering from his Text, to  
which he has at last found his way, and under his  
second Head, taking no Notice of the most obvi-  
ous, and most immediate and only certain Conse-  
quence from this Kingdom *not being of this World*,

F

viz.



viz. Non-Resistance to the Powers of this World, a Doctrine his L——p hates the very Sound of, he observes, that *if the Church be the Kingdom of Christ, and this Kingdom be not of THIS WORLD, this must appear from the Nature and End of the Laws of Christ, and of those Rewards and Punishments which are the Sanctions of his Laws.* This Explication makes our Saviour's Answer to Pilate extremely pertinent; but let us see what these Laws are. They are, his L——p tells us, *almost all APPEALS to the WILL of God; to his Nature, known by the common Reason of Mankind, and to the Imitation of that NATURE, which MUST be our PERFECTION.* No Place in his L——p's Sermon required more Exactness in treating it than this, and yet there is no one in which he has shewn less, which is a Demonstration of the great haste he was in. The Laws of Christ are here not only said to be Appeals, which is pretty strange Language; but appeals to the Imitation of the Nature of God, which in any other Writer I should make no Scruple to say is Nonsense. And I think his L——p is mistaken, when he says they are Appeals to the WILL and NATURE of God, known by the common Reason of Mankind. For since his L——p does not tell us how that Will is known, it looks as if he meant it were, as his Nature is, by the same common Reason of Mankind, which is a Misrepresentation of our Saviour's Meaning, who in the place from whence these Descriptions of his Laws are fetched, says nothing of the Nature of God, or of the common Reason of Mankind. For 'tis evident his L——p took the whole Description he gives us of these Laws from the Sermon in the Mount, without looking farther. In which our Saviour says, that *he only shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, who doth the WILL of his Father which is in Heaven.* His L——p should have

have remember'd our Saviour is here speaking to Jews, to whom were committed the *lively Oracles of God*, in which was fully contained the *Will* of God: He therefore means the *Will* declared to them in the *Law* and the *Prophets*, not as it is discoverable by human Reason, unassisted by the Light of *Revelation*. So likewise when our Saviour exhorts them to *imitate God their Father which is in Heaven*, he does not send them to the *Nature*, so properly as to the *Example* of God; nor to the essential Attributes of the supreme Being, as deduced by human Reason, but singly to the *divine Goodness* declared to them in the same sacred Books, and daily experienced in the common Providences which the good and bad share a like in: This both the Context and the parallel Place in *St. Luke* shew to be meant, when our Saviour exhorts them *to be perfect, even as their Father which is in Heaven is perfect*. This his L——p most inaccurately calls an *Appeal to the Imitation of the Nature of God*, and *this Appeal a Law*; and tells us, *this Imitation MUST BE our Perfection*; is our Perfection, I understand; but his L——p turns it into *must be*; whether to make it look more like a *Law*, I know not. But what is more material, his L——p calls these *Laws* which are no *Laws*, and takes no Notice of those Commands of Christ which are most peculiar to the Gospel, and may most properly be called his Laws. First he calls these Laws which are no Laws; for what our Saviour says in this Discourse, he says not as a *Law-giver*, but as a divine Teacher; he acts not in his *regal Capacity*, but in his *prophetick Office*, which his L——p could not but have observed, if he had minded either the Beginning or the End of that Discourse. The Account of which begins in these Words; *cap. 5. v. 2. He opened his Mouth and*

TAUGHT them, saying: And ends thus: *When Jesus had ended these Sayings, the People were astonished at his DOCTRINE* (not his Laws) *for he TAUGHT them* (not gave Laws to them) *as one having Authority, and not as the Scribes*, Chap. vii. 28, 29. But, secondly, he takes no Notice of those Commands of Christ which are those peculiar to the Gospel, and may most properly be called his *Laws*. I mean his Institutions of the Sacraments of *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*. The first of which he commanded after he was invested in the *Regal Office*, and all Power was given to him in *Heaven and in Earth*, and the other, just as he was entering upon it, and which *St. Paul* received afterwards by immediate Inspiration from him. But in this it must be confessed his *L—p* acts consistently, he had left them out of his *Definition* of the *Church* and it was for the same Reason proper to leave them out, when he was speaking of the *Laws* given to it. For having no Foundation in the Law of Nature they have no intrinsic Goodness in them, and unhappily minister Matter for Dispute, and thereby hinder that blessed Coalition which his *L—p* would introduce of all Persons professing Christ to be the *Messiah*. The Sanctions of these *Laws* of Christ are *REWARDS and PUNISHMENTS*, but of what sort? not the Rewards or Pains of this World at all. Very true, there is nothing of this World in the Rewards or Punishments that are made the Motives of our Obedience in the *New Testament*. How should there? How should one, who was no temporal Prince, annex temporal Sanctions to his Laws? But as the Righteousness commanded by the Gospel has a natural Tendency to promote the Welfare of the World, and the Happiness of human Life, so it is said to be profitable unto all things, having Promise of the Life that now is, and of that which is to come.



But from this negative Argument, because *Christ* has not annexed the Sanctions, which, consistently with the Character he appeared under, he could not annex to his Laws, His L——p argues, that our Saviour was absolutely against them; *that he was far from thinking they could be INSTRUMENTS of such a Persuasion as he thought acceptable to God.* I read nothing in the New Testament of acceptable Persuasions, nor of any Instruments of Persuasion; but if his L——p means, that our Saviour was far from thinking they could be of Service to promote the Practice of true Religion among those who should believe in him, I ask, how does that appear? certainly not from a bare Silence about them. For if our Lord was against every thing he has said nothing of, it may as well be supposed he was against the Continuance of his Church beyond the Lives of the Apostles, or at least against the Continuance of a Ministry, since there is nothing said by him of a Succession of Ministers, nor any Directions given for it. Put the case that the Jewish Governors instead of persecuting our Saviour and putting him to Death, had acknowledged the Truth of his Mission, and received him as their *Messiah*, or if he had been carried to Rome, and in Conference with the Emperor had convinced him of the Sin of Idolatry, and made him a Convert to his Gospel, does his L——p imagine, that in either of these Cases our Saviour would have been offended at the Offer of Protection and Encouragement from the Civil Power, in Favour of his Religion, and of all such as should embrace the Belief of it, as a thing unlawful and inconsistent with his own regal Dignity, or the Sanction of his Laws, and the Nature of his Religion? His L——p may think as he pleases, but for my own Part, I can see no grounds in the Conduct of our Saviour for such a Thought.

Thought. But his L——p brings *St. Paul* for his *Second*, as being in the same Sentiments; because he says, *2 Cor. v. 11. Knowing the Terrors of the Lord, we persuade Men*: This is the single Text his L——p has brought in support of the Point he was to prove in this Sermon. But had he not writ upon Memory, he would have seen it is not *Terrors*, but *Terror*; and that this *Terror* of the *Lord*, unless it should have been render'd the *Fear* of the *Lord*, and be put for Religion and the *Worship* of *God*, which is the Opinion of *Grius*, *Simon*, and others, is the Certainty of a future Judgment mentioned in the preceding verse, he would also have known by looking into the foregoing Chapters, that *St. Paul* is not giving an account of the Subject of his *Preachings*, but of the true Motive by which he was aided in his whole Conduct, in Defence of himself against the false Teachers that set up against him. Lastly had his L——p consider'd well the Expression of *αὐθιμίας* *σεβόμεν*, and compared it with *Gal. i. 10.* and *1 Cor. iv. 3.* he would have seen great Reason to suspect that the negative Particle has by some Accident been dropt in this Place, and that the true Reading is *ἐν αὐθιμίας* *σεβόμεν*, knowing the *Terror* of the *Lord*, we do not make our *Court* to Men, or study to please them, but endeavour to approve our selves to *God*. But let the Place mean what his L——p thinks it does, does *St. Paul* say any thing in it but what all other Preachers of the Gospel ever did, and constantly do say? Do they not press upon Christians the Duties of the Gospel chiefly from the Consideration of a future Judgment? Is not this the great Article of the Gospel, that *God has appointed a Day wherein he will judge the World by Jesus Christ*? But that does not hinder the recommending the same Duties by all other Motives

Motives that may contribute to induce Men to the faithful Practice of them. But his L——p is positive, that to apply worldly Motives in encouraging the true Religion, and discouraging what offends against it, is to act contrary to the Interests of true Religion, and is plainly opposite to the Maxims upon which Christ founded his Kingdom. But how does this appear? Our Saviour knew his Religion would for a long time be in a persecuted State, and therefore with great Wisdom adapts his Instructions to such a Condition, that his Disciples might be content to bear the Cross after his Example; and therefore in the most earnest manner he recommends to them a Contempt of the World, out of which he had chosen them, and a perfect Love and Unity among themselves. Nothing could shew more the Wisdom of our Saviour, or be more for the Service of the Gospel he came to preach, than such Precepts to those who would be his Disciples in the then State of Things; but did he think that State would always continue? Did not he know the Time would come, when the Kingdoms of the Earth would become the Kingdoms of the Lord, and that Kings would be nursing Fathers, and Queens nursing Mothers of his Church? which they could be no other way, but by putting an end to its Persecutions, and giving to it the Protection and Encouragement of wise and good Laws? Our Saviour knew this would be, but it was at a great Distance, and therefore he always addresses himself to his Disciples as being in other Circumstances, as Persons in a private Capacity, exposed to continual Persecutions for the Faith, and without any Protection for their Religion from the Civil Powers. But when those Days of Tryal were at an end, and the Emperors embraced the Faith, all Christians received so great a Blessing as they ought,



ought, thanked God for that his great Goodness to them, and gladly accepted the Assistance of the Imperial Authority to establish Christianity, and to protect the Church by such Laws, as would most effectually secure it against *Heresy* and *Schism*. This was the Sense of the Church then, and they must have been *Visionaries* and *Enthusiasts* to have had any other Sense of it. And if his L——p had seen only the Persecutions many of them had undergone, I am strongly persuaded he would have been of the same Mind.

But his L——p says, if *worldly Motives* can be the true SUPPORTS of a KINGDOM WHICH IS NOT OF THIS WORLD, then *Sincerity* and *Hypocrisy*, *Religion* and *no Religion*, &c. are become the same thing? But who says, these are the true Supports? Which Expression is intended to exclude those that are the primary and most proper ones. No body, that I have ever heard of: But many have said, and truly said, that those Motives may, as additional Supports, be made very good Use of to promote *Piety* and *Virtue*, the Ends of all true Religions: And that Governors, whether in Church and State, by a proper Application of Rewards and Punishments, are a Terror to *evil* Works, and for the Praise of them that do *well*. But human Laws cannot reach the Heart, which is the Seat of true Religion: True, but they can reach the outward Act, they can restrain the doing *Evil*, and that is a great Step to doing *Good*, and when good Discipline is joined with good Instructions, it is of great Force to instil into Men true *Virtue*. For if the outward Actions be habitually good, the Heart will become so too. If this be not so, I would ask, what makes one *Family*, one *School*, one *College*, one *Nation*, more virtuous than another; what but better Discipline and Government, the making

of wise and good Rules, and a prudent and faithful Execution of them? But these *worldly* Motives make Men *Hypocrites* often instead of *sincere* Converts. True again, they have sometimes this Effect; they can't absolutely and certainly reach the Heart; that is, they can't do all that could be wished, therefore they can do nothing, therefore they ought to be laid aside. Fine Logic this! Sure it requires no great Wisdom to see the Imperfection of human Affairs to be such, that no Scheme can be so wisely contrived, but that it will have its Inconveniencies. That is the best, that has the fewest. With his L——p's leave therefore I can't consent to give up our *Establishment*, because there are some few Inconveniencies in it, all I see his L——p's Plan of a Church distinctly laid down, and drawn out into all its Parts; and it is shewn, that it is attended with Inconveniencies fewer in Number, or lesser in Degree. Till this is shewn, which *I will prophesy* never can be shewn, I must look on it as a wild absurd Scheme, which would bring with it a thousand Evils for one it would remove, with respect both to Church and State. The Faith of the Church ought to be secured from the Corruption of *Heresies*, and its Unity from the Mischiefs of causeless Separations, by the Censures it has a Right to inflict; and the Interest the State has in preventing the Mischiefs that unavoidably attend the Distractions of the People in matters of Religion, to pass by other Reasons, gives it a Right to enforce the Censures of the Church by good and wholesome Laws. And how is any more inconsistent with the *spiritual* Sanctions of *Christ's* Laws, that Church Censures should be attended with civil Penalties upon Offenders, than it is with the same Sanctions, for St. *Paul* to inflict a *corporal* Punishment in Virtue of

his *Apostolical* Power on the like Offenders, I must own I can't see, only that Governors may be mistaken in their Application of them. This therefore is no Objection in such Cases where they can't well be mistaken; and a few Mistakes are not to be put in the Balance against the great Advantages arising to Religion and Virtue, by the Civil Power interesting themselves in the Encouragement of them. This, in my humble Opinion, is so far from being a Misapplication of Power, that it is the best Use of it. *Schisms* and *Heresies* are the Things discouraged by Laws made in Favour of the Church. *Schism* is a causeless Separation; a causeless Separation is to separate when it was their Duty not to do so; 'tis therefore an Offence against the Government of the Church, and an Offence of extreme ill Consequence. What Reason therefore can be given why it should not be discouraged by all proper Ways? So for *Heresy*; 'tis the setting up of new Doctrines against the Faith, and when they are what they are called, they generally speaking proceed from an evil Mind and corrupt Heart and open a way to all manner of Licentiousness: St. Paul therefore thunders out against such the severest Censures, *If any Man love not the Lord Jesus, let him be ANATHEMA, MARANATHA*. And the Church in the like Case has a Right, whether Duty to follow his Example, and the Magistrate may lawfully and commendably enforce their Censures with the Power he is invested with as the *Minister of God*.

But 'tis endless to follow his L——p through all the various Ways he takes of repeating the same Things; in which he sets up a *Phantom* of his own, and then in great Triumph insists on it, as if it were the current Opinion, when the truth 'tis such as no body maintains. And there



fore passing over many lesser Matters, which are as liable to Censure as any others I have taken Notice of, I will give the Reader his L——p's Conclusions from this important Doctrine. The first is, *That the greatest Mistakes in Judgment about the Nature of Christ's Kingdom, or Church, have arisen from hence, that Men have argued from other VISIBLE Kingdoms, to what ought to be VISIBLE in his.*

—— Whereas he hath POSITIVELY WARNED them against any such Arguings, by assuring them that this Kingdom is his Kingdom, and that it is not of this World. Positively warned them! by assuring them, that this Kingdom is his Kingdom! I have already shewn that this Assertion is altogether false: Christ has no where said, *my Kingdom is my Kingdom*; that is a Proposition worthy of his L——p, who deals much in *Identicals*; no such Curiosities are to be found in Scripture, and as little can we find, where our Saviour has said, *the Church is a Kingdom*. But his L——p will have it, that Christ hath assured us that it is; and by such Assurance, joined to that other, *that his Kingdom is not of this World*, hath warned, POSITIVELY WARNED us against all Arguings from other Kingdoms to his. A Man can't better show himself destitute of good Arguments, than by laying so great a Weight upon so few Words. I have shewn at large, that nothing can be a more groundless Assertion, and therefore the Inference built on it must fall on course.

The second Inference is, that *the Kingdom of Christ is the Number of Persons who are sincerely and willingly Subjects to him*. This is the same in Substance with the Definition he has given of the Church before, and therefore is already fully answered; only 'tis embellish'd by assuring us in many Words, that the *throwing off all Regard to all other Authority*, is the best Proof of our Subjection

to the Authority of *Christ*, as if subordinate Authorities were inconsistent, and the Bulk of Mankind had no need of Instructors, or would learn the better from them, the less Regard they have to them.

His L——p's third Observation is, *that it destroys the AUTHORITY OF CHRIST as King, to set up any other Authority, to which his Subjects are indispensably and absolutely obliged to submit their Consciences, or their Conduct, in what is properly called Religion.* This is what we have had in every Page already; such an Authority no body, no Protestant at least maintains; and any other is not inconsistent with the Authority of *Christ*: But his L——p has no where told us *what is properly called Religion*, except in his Introduction; where 'tis upon the Authority of *St. James* declared to be *Purity and Charity*; which I suspect his L——p had forgot when these Words fell from his Pen; for no body can think it is with respect to those two Virtues particularly, that his L——p has denied absolute Authority to the Ministers of *Christ*, but with respect to Matters of *Faith*; which Expression is so much clearer than those his L——p has used, that I can imagine but one Reason why he did not use it, *viz.* that he might contradict in Sense only, and not in Terms, the 20<sup>th</sup> Article, wherein it is declared, that the Church has *Authority* in Controversies of *Faith*. This therefore I impute to his L——p's Prudence, not his Haste. But to proceed: In this Paragraph his L——p expresses himself extremely offended with two sorts of Men; first, those who contend for such an Authority as obliges to *Unity of Profession*. To make this look odious, he adds, *that is to profess even what they do not, what they cannot believe to be true.* If there be any such Men, their Fault I think lies not in contending for *Unity of Profession*,

sion, but in not taking care that the Things to be  
 professed be such as ought to be professed. The o-  
 ther sort his L——p is displeased with, are those  
 who would retain such an Authority as shall ob-  
 lige Men to forbear the *Profession and Publication*  
*of what they do believe, let them believe it of never*  
*so great Importance.* This also is an Authority no  
 body I know contends for in the crude manner in  
 which 'tis here expressed. But wise and good Men  
 have always been of Opinion, and always will be,  
 that an Obedience of *Silence* is due to Authority,  
 either in Ecclesiastical or Civil Matters ordinarily,  
 and under proper Limitations. For if a plenary  
 indulgence were allowed to all People to libel the  
 Government in Church or State at Pleasure, un-  
 der the Notion of publishing what they believe to  
 be of great Importance, there would soon be no  
 Government at all. No body is bound to contra-  
 dict every thing that is an Error, much less what  
 is upon slight Grounds shall think so: If a Man  
 can't assent to what he is persuaded is wrong, yet  
 where his Conscience will permit him to hold his  
 tongue. To expose and defame a Constitution,  
 because it is not so perfect as it might be, which  
 such a Liberty unavoidably leads to, can't be de-  
 manded by any wise Man: For the only Reason  
 that can be assigned for such a Liberty, is, that  
 the Government may be in every such Point  
 mended; but no wise Man ever thought it rea-  
 sonable to be always *tinkering* and altering a Go-  
 vernment, till every thing was made as perfect  
 as possible; much less as often as every capricious  
 Tumour shall think it wants mending. But if a  
 silence must be strictly observed, it may be said, no  
 defects or Faults, how great soever they be, will  
 ever be mended, so long as no body shall dare to  
 mention there are any. Why so? Can't Persons who  
 have



have Scruples upon any Point apply to their *Superiours* in a modest and respectful way, and desire to be heard? Have we not *Parliaments* and *Conventions*, where Representations may be made of Grievances, whether in civil or religious Matters? No body by an Obligation to Silence is precluded the use of these Methods.

But what makes his L<sup>ds</sup> Censure still more unreasonable, is, that there has been for some years a great Tenderness and Indulgence shewn by our Spiritual as well as Civil Governours with respect to the publick Oppositions that have been made in Print, not only to such things as are particular to single Church and to our own Constitution, but even against the *Primitive* and *Catholic* Doctrines, acknowledged as such in all Churches; even this has been allowed or connived at when done with Decency and Modesty, with a design to inform or to inform themselves, not to sow Divisions or inflame the Populace. Which is a Liberty, that is, I believe in no Christian Countrey suffered in the degree it is in ours; and it must be acknowledged, that very great Objections lye against it, from the Opportunity it gives to Faction and Enthusiasm, Hereticks and Schismatics, to Libertines, Deists and Atheists, to seduce the *unlearned* and *unstable* under the Pretence of new Lights, who are tossed to and fro, and carried about with every Wind of Doctrine, by the slight of Men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive; to the great prejudice of true Religion and Virtue, and to the apparent disturbance of the Civil Government, perhaps the total subversion of both. So that a Liberty therefore does almost unavoidably do a great deal of hurt tho' not design'd, but with good Effects it can have in proportion to its abuses, is not so easy to see; because the Christian

Faith cannot be made or unmade now, nothing being the true Faith, that was not so from the beginning. And as long as the Church teaches nothing but what was expressly taught in the purest Times, or is perfectly agreeable thereto, 'tis in vain for any one to attempt to prove it in an error.

His L——p will not want to be told, that I say this with a view to the present Disputes concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, which I presume, gave occasion to his L——p to express himself with so much wrath against an obedience of Silence, as well as of Assent, both which he wisely and piously declares to be insupportable to an honest and christian Mind. I will therefore beg leave for his L——p's information, who seems by his Answer to the L<sup>d</sup> Bishop of Oxford's Charge to be under a great mistake in this Matter, to observe to him, that the *Nicene* Faith was not the effect of Party-interest or Court-influence, as he very unjustly, tho' I dare say, very innocently insinuates, when he says, that the deciding of Controversies in Matters of Religion by Councils, is a Method that did not begin effectually to show it self till the Emperor was become a profess'd Christian, and it was worth while for the Ambitious to disturb, crush and oppress one another. I would ask his L——p, to say nothing at present of other Hereticks, whether *Paul* of *Samosata* was not condemn'd by a Council, and effectually condemn'd, long before the Council of *Nice*, and let him tell us who then was Emperor: But it was not for his L——p's turn to remember this, his Head was full of the *Arian* and *Antiarian* Synods, which drew from him the Invective that follows the Words last cited, against Councils in general, damning and in their Turns condemn'd by each other, as the Emperors favoured or were against them. This

Account

Account his L——p gives of Councils, without Exception to the four first general ones, or even to the first of them, that of *Nice*. Should his L——p be called on to defend this Censure, he will shelter himself no doubt under his great Oracle Mr. *Chillingworth*, though the same Oracle might have taught him to speak of them with a little more Decency as well as Truth; for Mr. *Chillingworth* confesses the Judgment of a Council, tho' not infallible, is yet so far directive and obliging, that without apparent Reason to the contrary, it may be Sin to reject it, at least not to afford it an outward Submission for publick Peace sake.

But whatever may be objected to other Councils, I will shew his L——p that he is extremely mistaken, when he imputes the Resolutions of that of *Nice*, either to the Emperor's Influence, or to the Prevalence of a Faction; for he wants not, I presume, to be told that the Tyranny of the Papacy was not then in being. *Constantine's* Design in calling that Council, was purely to restore Peace to the Church, and to put a speedy end to those Feuds and Animosities that the novel Doctrines of *Arius* had occasioned, which gave great Advantage to the Enemies of Christianity, and threaten'd nothing less than the total Ruin of it. For tho' they began at *Alexandria*, they soon spread farther, and all had been in a Flame, if they had not been timely put a stop to. It was this, and this only determined *Constantine* to call a general Council, when he found all other Methods ineffectual; and when assembled, he left it to them to determine upon the Points in Question, as they should find to be most agreeable to Scripture, and the true Catholick Faith; and 'tis certain they did, according to the Liberty given them, condemn the Doctrines of *Arius*, with a very great Unanimity, as dangerous and heretical Innovations;



novations, few dissenting, and among those few  
 were those who had the greatest Interest at the  
 Court, which is a Demonstration that their Reso-  
 lutions were not the effect of Court Influence,  
 and without that Influence there could be no room  
 for the Prevalency of a Faction, nor is there any  
 pretence for such a charge. 'Tis hard therefore,  
 if such a Council shall not be allow'd to know  
 what the *Faith* was that had been deliver'd down  
 to them, and as hard to think the antient *Faith*  
 was not agreeable to the Scriptures, 'tis next to  
 giving up *Christianity* as a Cheat and Imposture,  
 to think God would suffer his Church to err so  
 soon, in so fundamental a Point as they did, if the  
*Nicene* Council err'd in their Decisions, since 'tis  
 evident from all the Monuments left us of the Pri-  
 mitive Church, that their Decisions may be trac'd  
 to the very earliest of those that are certainly  
 genuine, or at least that there is nothing to be  
 found inconsistent with them.  
 These Considerations make it very justly to be  
 doubted, whether the Fundamental and Univer-  
 sally receiv'd Articles of the *Christian Faith*  
 should be suffer'd to be the Subjects of Pam-  
 phlets, which come into all Hands, and not on-  
 ly fill the Minds of ignorant well meaning Peo-  
 ple with endless Scruples and Perplexities; but  
 give the Enemies of Religion a Handle to call  
 every thing into doubt, as if nothing either were,  
 could be certain in the Gospel Revelation. The  
 Wisdom, I say, of suffering this may be just Mat-  
 ter of doubt, whatever allowance may be given  
 Matters of an inferior Nature, and which are  
 of great consequence, whichever way  
 they be decided, or however People may differ  
 in their Opinions of them; tho' even in such,  
 where there is an establish'd Church, 'tis ridicu-  
 lous,

lous for any one to desire a liberty to insult it with impunity.

But his L——p has one terrible Objection still behind, against requiring from any Persons a submission of *Silence*, which I should have least expected from his L——p of all Men living; and that is, that without such a Liberty the *Reformation* never could have been made, nor can be defended. When his L——p talks at this rate, 'tis plain he thinks of any *Reformation* rather than our own, which was made in a regular Way, and by our Governours; nor did our first *Reformers* in the main require any less obedience either of *Assent* or *Silence*, than is requir'd now; so that we have not departed from the Principles of our *Reformers* with respect to Authority in Religious Matters, but should do so greatly, if we were to go into his L——p's Notions. But I will not defend our *Reformation* from any thing particular in it, I will suppose we reformed in *England*, as regularly as they did in other Countries: What then? Does it follow that a submission of *Silence* is not due to Authority in a Church well reformed because it could not have been reform'd if such Submission had been inviolably paid to the corrupt Church, from which they did reform? May the obedience of the Members of the Church be denied to their lawful Superiors at any time, because it may be necessary it should be at some time? Sure his L——p, who has so well defended the *Revolution*, can help us out in this difficulty: 'Tis but distinguishing between *ordinarily* and *extraordinarily*, and the Business is done. Obedience is *ordinarily* due to our *civil* Governours, therefore the People are always to be taught obedience; but if the Government should degenerate into Tyranny (an odious Case, which therefore

whether the Laws of any Country, nor the Gospel sup-  
 poses) natural Reason directs a Nation to a Remedy,  
 which when the Grievances are universal, they  
 will have recourse to without any Directions from  
 their Teachers for it. So in Matters of Religion,  
 Obedience, as being necessary for the Peace of the  
 Church, is ordinarily due to the Injunctions of our  
 Superiors, which are presumed to be lawful and  
 just, till the contrary appears. But if they should  
 abuse their Authority, and destroy the End of their  
 Institution, and tyrannize over the Consciences and  
 Rights of the People, as the *Papacy* or Court of  
*Rome* did before the Reformation, the People will  
 then withdraw their Obedience, and assert their  
*Spiritual* Liberties, as in the other Case their *Civil*  
 ones. This our Nation did at the Reformation;  
 and when the like Cause is given, will no doubt do  
 so again. But certainly 'tis very unreasonable to  
 turn the Exception into the Rule, and to preach  
 up Disobedience either to *Spiritual* or *Civil* Gover-  
 nors in general Terms, which even upon his L—p's  
 Principles, can never be lawful, but when 'tis ne-  
 cessary. But 'tis in vain to tell his L——p, that  
 the Obedience I contend for, is necessary for the  
 Peace of the Church; this *Peace*, in his L——p's  
 sense, is *Stupidity* and *Lethargy*; be it so, I think  
 either of them preferable to the Convulsions and  
 Ravings of People distracted with the Madness of  
*Enthusiasm*, which would be the unavoidable Ef-  
 fect of his Lordship's Scheme, if any Credit may  
 be given to what has always been the Opinion of  
 the wisest Men, or to the Experience of all Times.  
 People *stupid* and *lethargick* hurt none but them-  
 selves, but Men in a raging Fever no body is safe  
 from, and therefore I desire to be out of their way,  
 or that they may be out of mine.



And thus I have at last gone thro' his L——p's Sermon, which is in all respects so unworthy of his Pen, and so much below his great Character, that there is a Necessity of supposing it was made in the greatest Haste and Hurry of Thought, for which Reason I can't think it either *kind* in the *Convocation*, or that it was *worth their while* to take so much Notice of it as they did. Not *kind*; for who could help seeing it was a hasty Composition? And if it was, would it not have become the Candor of such a Body to make a proportionable Allowance for the many Faults of it? But if they would not be so *kind*, yet how could they think it *worth their while* to censure it? Which if they had not done, such a Production would have died as soon as born, and had long since been buried in deep Oblivion, hasty Births being never long lived.

If any could doubt before, whether his L——p's Sermon had a Right to the Excuse I have in these Papers made for it, I hope these Remarks have put it beyond all question, and that this is the true Reason why his L——p's Design is no better executed. If I had not enter'd into so particular a Proof of it, it might justly be presumed from hence, that this Sermon was made at a time, when one may well suppose his L——p intended a Discourse of another Nature, and more suitable to the Season, the solemn Time of *Lent*, in the middle of which he was to preach. It cannot therefore fairly be supposed to have been made in pursuance of his L——p's first Intention, but that it was occasioned by some Incident thrown of a sudden in his way afterwards, which would neither let him pursue his first Subject, nor allow him time to write with Care upon this. For his L——p is too good a Judge of Men and Things, not to know that the Subject he had undertaken was of the nicest Nature.

ture, and required the most skilful Hand, and that it would be very difficult, especially for one in his L—p's Situation, who could not but know he had already given great Offence by some Parts of his *Preservative*, to avoid Censure; and that the Censure which on this Occasion should fall on him, would at the same time affect those for whose Service he has professed the greatest Zeal; the Event has but too well shewn, how much Disaffection this one Sermon has occasioned, and it was easy for a Person of less Penetration than his L—p to foresee it would. These Considerations, if I may borrow a Word his L—p has in a manner appropriated to his own Use, are to me *Demonstrations*, that some sudden, urgent, unforeseen Cause, forced his L—p upon this Subject, and that nothing but want of Time hinder'd a Person of his uncommon Abilities from treating it in a manner less offensive: for if he had not been extremely streighten'd in time, had he had but enough to read his Sermon over after it was made, can one think he would not here and there have inserted some saving Words? Would he not once have said, *I would not be mistaken*; or *I would not be understood* to be against all Authority, or against the Constitution and Establishment of our own excellent Church? Such sorts of Salvos must have found some place in this Sermon, if his L—p had the least room left him to reflect a second time upon it; unless it can be supposed that he had a mind to give Offence for Reasons I shall not name, or that he is in earnest against the whole of our Establishment, and would have all the Laws in Favour of the Church repealed, which I shall never believe, till I see his L—p quit either his Order, or the Honours and Advantages annexed to it.

What the particular Inducement was that made his L—p turn his Thoughts from the Season to the

the Subject of Church Authority, I dare not affirm, his L——p having said somewhere, that he writ it *without the least View of pleasing or displeasing any Man living*; by which, if he meant that he has not writ what he did not think, to make his Court to any one; I readily believe it: But would his L——p have chosen just at that time to give his Hearers his Thoughts upon that Subject, if he had not been determined to it by some Things that were then in Agitation? As his L——p declared himself in his Sermon against *negative Discouragements*; so I remember just at that time there was among some People great Expectation of a *Bill* being brought into Parliament to take them away. And if it will consist with his L——p's Declaration of having no View, I should strongly believe, that was the true Inducement to his preaching this Sermon. But why his L——p did not think the *House of Lords* a properer Place to speak his Thoughts on that Point, than *St. James's Chapel*, I can't imagine. Did he think a hasty Sermon would affect the Passions of such a Bill, or could influence those to be for it who would otherwise be against it? Or that it was of Importance to the Cause, or of any Service to himself, to bear his Testimony so early, and so unnecessarily? Either of these are weak Suppositions, and the latter inconsistent with the Sincerity his L——p always acts with.

But whatever was his L——p's Inducement to write, if it be plain he writ in haste, and there be such Marks of it throughout the Sermon as I have represented, his L——p has a Right, if he will insist on it, to great Allowances to be made him for the Parts that have given so much Offence; and I can but wonder nobody in *Convocation* would argue thus in his Behalf, which had it been well urged, must have had a very good Effect. But perhaps it will



be said, the *Committee* were not offended at his L——p's ill Execution of his Design, but at the Design it self, as tending to introduce a total Confusion into the Church, and subverting Discipline and Government, and all use of the most reasonable Authority; and that it was those evil Tendencies which gave so much Offence. I wish I could say in Answer, that his L——p's Sermon had no such Tendencies, but whatever his Design were, which I shall not presume to enquire farther into; as the great Inaccuracy that appears in the Execution of it, is, in my Opinion, the best Excuse that can be made for it, so I have pushed this Argument in its Defence, as far as I fairly could, and shewn that his L——p has only raised a thick Dust, but proved nothing.

—— Πάντα κόνις ἢ πάντα τὸ μηδέν.

The whole Verse runs thus.

Πάντα γέλωτος, ἢ πάντα κόνις ἢ πάντα τὸ μηδέν.

But I desire it may be observed that I make no Application of the first Part of it. I might indeed have made his L——p's Sermon appear still worse than it is in it self, by an Epitome of it, after the Example which his L——p in his great Wisdom and Goodness has set in his last inimitable Performance: But I think there is no occasion for it, nor can I yet persuade my self upon a single Authority to go into a Method so perfectly new. If what I have done will in any measure satisfy his L——p's Enemies, I have my end. For to his Friends his Sermon wants no Apology; they will be ready enough to say, —— *Non tali Auxilio, nec Defensoribus istis Noster eget*; its very Faults are Beauties in their Eyes, who admire and applaud the whole

whole Performance in such a manner, that they seem to measure their esteem of it by the dis-esteem 'tis in with others. Witness the Encomiums bestowed on his L——p by the pious and learned *Nazarenes*; witness the Incense offered to him by the more pious *Independent Whig*; who in his bitter Zeal against the Clergy, raises a Monument of Praise to his L——p, upon the Ruins of the Reputation of the whole Order, and professes himself so great an Admirer of his eminent Abilities and other distinguishing Qualities, that he is impatient to see him preferred suitably to his great Merit; and is so sure the Interests of Truth and Liberty are nearly concerned in it, that he would have both Houses of Parliament address his Majesty to give his L——p the best Bishoprick in England; for which no doubt he thinks his L——p extremely well qualified, from the Care he has hitherto taken of a little one; having the Honour to be the first, at least since the Revolution, who has made a Bishoprick a *sine Cure*.

If so great Authorities can have any weight, I hope it will give no Offence, that I intreat for Favour and better Quarter for a Person so deserving One, whom even his Enemies must allow to be charitable, meek, dispassionate, disinterested, pious, learned, judicious Man; *learned and judicious*, for he has read \**Chillingworth* and *Hales*; *pious*, for he has made some Prayers; *disinterested*, for he ever where declares against the Rewards of this World tho' he so well deserve them; *dispassionate*, for he is *calm and undisturbed* under the greatest Provocations; *very meek*, for he shews no Resentments but of Pity towards those unhappy Men that have writ against him; and extremely *charitable*, for he is perpetually complaining of the want of it in others: Where 'tis easy to shew from almost every one of his L——p Books, that his Adversaries are strange Creatures.

Men of Avarice and Ambition, governed by Interest and Passion, without Charity, Learning or Judgment, which last Characters need no other Proof, than that they dare to differ from him, which they never do, but at the same time they differ from themselves, and run into perpetual Contradictions.

\* I doubt I have said too much in supposing his L—p to be so well read in Mr. Chillingworth, or upon looking into his Works for the Passages quoted out of him in p. 238, 239, 240, of his last Book, and finding some very material Omissions, I have discovered that his L—p did not take them from the Author himself, but at second hand from Dr. Clark's Preface to his *Scripture Doctrine*, p. 13, 14, where are all the same Passages, with all the same Omissions, with this difference, that the good Bishop has given us the Words of Dr. Clark, which contain the Sense of a Latin Quotation not Englished by Mr. Chillingworth, as if they had been his. Which shews his L—p in this last Performance to be the same hasty Writer I have shewn him to be in his Sermon; of which there are indeed numberless other Proofs, especially in his Explications of *Scripture*, where 'tis his L—p's Misfortune to be most mistaken in those Places, in which it was his concern most not to be mistaken; of which, asking the Bishop of Oxford's Pardon, I will give the Reader one Instance, and then take leave of him. His L—p in p. 136. proves *there can be no right in fallible Men to such an Authority*, as he is there opposing, — because Christ is said, *Heb. xiii. 2.* to be the Author and Finisher of our Faith (that is, says the Bishop, *τελειωτης, Perfector*) of that Faith which was Once



delivered to the Saints, such as it was TO BE CON-  
TENDED FOR, long before ANY COUNCIL of un-  
spired Men met to DELIVER it to them OVER AGAIN  
in another form. Here is a vast Weight laid upon  
the Sound of some Scripture Words, without the  
least Indication that his L—p knew the true  
Sense of them; and yet his Words shew he had  
looked into the Original, the Sense of which is  
plainly this, and nothing else, that we should run  
with Patience the Race of Faith set before us, be-  
ing not only encouraged to it by the heroick Ex-  
amples recorded in the preceding Chapter, but  
having Jesus also for our Pattern, who has him-  
self led the glorious Way, is the *author* of Author, and  
will be our Rewarder *eternally*, will crown our  
Sufferings at the last Day with a happy Immor-  
tality. [See Heb. ii. 10. 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.] Who  
now is this to the Churches having or not hav-  
ing Authority in Articles of Faith? Sure his  
L—p will in time be cured of this strange  
Inaccuracy, and will, before he writes again, be  
persuaded seriously to read over the New Testa-  
ment, or not meddle in Controversies, where there  
is no taking one step right, without a good know-  
ledge of it.

## F I N I S.

## ERRATA.

Page 13. line 1. r. exactness in a regard to particu-  
Times. P. 17. l. 26. r. *Excellency*. P. 22. l. 24. r. *ad-  
vantage*. P. 28. l. 23. for *from*, r. for *an*. P. 31. l. 18. r. *the  
true reason*, and after *misapplied* a full stop. P. 46. l. 17. *as-  
sisted*, r. *acted*. P. 49. l. 31. r. *gives*. P. 50. l. 30. r. *Cer-  
tures*.

*Books lately printed for* JONAH BOWYER  
at the Rose the West End of St.  
Paul's Church-yard.

SIR William Dugdale's History and Antiquities  
of St. Paul's Cathedral. The second Edition.  
*Folio.*

Mr. Kettlewell's Works, 2 Vol. *Folio.*

Archbishop Whigg's Life, *Folio.*

A new Voyage to the South Seas. By Mr. Pre-  
rior, 4to.

Dr. South's Sermons, 6 Vol.

Bishop Hickman's Sermons, 2 Vol.

Bishop Smalridge's Sermons.

An original Draught of the Primitive Church,  
in Answer to Sir P. K.'s Enquiry, 8vo.

The E. of Peterborough's Conduct in Spain, 8vo.

Archbishop of Cambray's Education of a Daugh-  
ter, 12mo.

Mr. Stayno of Education, 8vo.

Dr. Snape's two Letters to the Bishop of Ban-  
gor.

A Defence of Mr. Mills, &c.

In the Press, and will speedily be Published.

**A**N Appeal to the Word of God for the  
Terms of Christian Salvation; Or a Discourse  
proving that Sincerity exclusive of the Method of  
Religion which a Man follows, is not sufficient  
to entitle him to the Kingdom of Heaven. With  
a Preface, in which is contained a Reply to  
much of the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Answer to  
the Reverend the Dean of Worcester's Sermon,  
and of his Postscript in Answer to the Lord Bishop  
of Oxford, as relates to this Subject. By *John  
Stabbing, M. A. Rector of Rickingham in Suffol.*  
and late Fellow of St. Catherine's Hall in Cambridge.

